United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,415	01/16/2004	William S. Brusilow	2930-109	5654
6449 7590 07/09/2007 ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER	
			VAKILI, ZOHREH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DEL WEDVA (ODE
,			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/09/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/758,415	BRUSILOW, WILLIAM S.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Zohreh Vakili	1614			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	lanking and discount				
8) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	· •				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)	_				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-11, drawn to a method of treating a polyglutamine disease, classified in class 514, subclass 706.
- II. Claims 12-18, drawn to a composition, classified in class 514, subclass728.
- III. Claim 19, drawn to a method for decreasing neuronal polyglutamine, classified in class 514, subclass 740.
- IV. Claim 20, drawn to a method for decreasing the amount of huntingtin protein, classified in class 514, subclass 706.

Inventions I, III, IV and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using.

Rejoinder Notice

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are

Art Unit: 1614

subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Election

Application/Control Number: 10/758,415

Art Unit: 1614

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention.

The following specie election is required also regarding the election of either of Groups I, II, III or IV, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Specifically, regardless of which Group Applicant elects Applicant is required to define each of 1) the compound (i.e. L-methionine) a second compound (i.e. Congo red) if the elected embodiment is one chosen having two compounds and a specific species of disease (ie. Huntington's disease). Currently, claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, and 11 are generic for Group I, claim 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 are generic for Group II, claim 19 is generic for group III, and claim 20 is generic for group IV.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

Art Unit: 1614

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Election/Restrictions Proper

MPEP §809.02(d) states "[w]here only generic claims are presented, no restriction can be required except in those applications where the generic claims recite such a multiplicity of species that an unduly extensive and burdensome search is necessary.". Here, the claims recited such a multiplicity of species that an unduly extensive and burdensome search would be necessary if all of the claimed species were to be examined simultaneously.

The present claims are directed to multiple inventions. Present claim 1 for example provides a variety of possibilities for the active agent. Further, as shown by the following classifications, a majority of the combinations encompassed by the present claims has acquired a separate status in the art. For example, if the active agent methionine it is classified in class 514 subclass 706 whereas if the active agent is sulfoximine it is classified in class 514 subclass 728. Notwithstanding that the classification of some of the active agents is co-extensive, all of the claimed compounds are patently distinct and fully capable of supporting separate patents.

The inventions above are patentably distinct. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. Burden

consists not only of specific searching of classes and subclasses, but also of searching multiple databases for foreign references and literature searches. Burden also resides in the examination of independent claim sets for clarity, enablement, and double patenting issues. Further, a reference that would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another group. Finally, the consideration for patentability is different in each case. Thus, it would be an undue burden to examine all of the above inventions in one application and the restriction for examination purposes as indicated above is deemed proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Conclusion

No claims of the present application are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Zohreh Vakili, telephone number 571-272-3099. The examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, can be reached at 571-272-0718. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Application/Control Number: 10/758,415 Page 7

Art Unit: 1614

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zohreh Vakili Patent Examiner Art Unit 1614

June 7, 2007

ARDIN H. MARSCHEL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER